Tells the Facts and Names the Names

$2.50

CounterPunch

Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair

VOL. 12, NO. 01

Our Little Secrets

Disaster Relief as Scam

By Alexander Cockburn

Some kind of automatic switch-on activated my FM radio the other day and a querulous, nagging whine filled the room, ultimately identifying itself as Sean Hannity. I'd never listened to him before and the experience made me feel more kindly about Rush Limbaugh. Even the tonnage of oxy-contin – aka hillbilly heroin – Rush has ingested over the years has left him with some sort of a functioning brain and a crude sense of humor. Hannity has no brain and no humor. His theme, for the ten minutes I endured him, was America's generous disbursements to the victims of the tsunami. On and on he went as though the entire meaning and consequence of the great tidal wave had been to advertise the innate generosity of the US government.

The politics of disaster relief are invariably unappetizing. Come back six months later and you'll probably find that most of the money pledged by Uncle Sam has never left the country, being sent to major corporations here trying to offload unneeded and probably rotting food surpluses and defective equipment. The money that is sent has political strings attached, and ends up being stolen by corrupt officials and middle-men at the other end. It would be far better for communities here to make voluntary collections, buy a ticket for a couple of honest locals, stuff the money in their pockets with instructions to find a village and hand it out personally to the inhabitants, with a message of good will and support. Or hire a plane, fly over the village and throw the money out the window. It would do far

(**OLS** *continued on page 2)*

The Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program infects all academia with the viruses of dishonesty and distrust as participant scholars cloak their intentions and their ties to the cloaked masters they serve.

The CIA's Campus Spies

By DAVID H. PRICE

The secrecy surrounding the current use of university classrooms as covert training grounds for the CIA and other agencies now threatens the fundamental principles of academic openness as well as the integrity of a wide array of academic disciplines. A new test program that is secretly placing CIA agents in American university classrooms has been operating without detection or protest, and with time these students who cannot admit to their true intentions will inevitably pollute and discredit the universities in which they are now enrolled.

There have long been tensions between the needs of academia and those of the National Security State, and even before the events of 9/11 expanded the powers of American intelligence agencies, our universities were being quietly modified to serve the needs of the intelligence community in new and covert ways. The most visible of these reforms was the establishment of the National Security Education Program (NSEP) which siphoned off students from traditional foreign language funding programs such as Fulbright or Title VI. While traditional funding sources provide students with small stipends of a few thousand dollars to study foreign languages in American universities, the NSEP gives graduate students bountiful funds (at times exceeding $40,000 a year) to study "in demand" languages, but with pay-back stipulations mandating that recipients later work for unspecified U.S. national security agencies.

At its debut in the early 1990s, the NSEP was harshly criticized for breaching a supposed barrier between the desires of academia and the state. Numerous academic organizations, including the Middle East Studies Association and the African Studies Association, Latin American Studies Association, and even the mainstream Boards of the Social Science Research Council and American Council of Learned Societies expressed deep concerns over scholars' participation in the NSEP. And though the NSEP continues funding students despite these protests, there was some solace in knowing so many diverse academic organizations condemned this program.

But while many academics reacted with anger and protest to the NSEP's entry onto American campuses, there has been no public reaction to an even more troubling post-9/11 funding program which upgrades the existing American intelligence-university-interface. With little notice Congress approved section 318 of the 2004 Intelligence Authorization Act which appropriated four million dollars to

(**Spies** *continued on page 4)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(**OLS** *continued from page 1*)
more good.

My favorite relief story concerns the Choctaw Nation, sent along the Trail of Tears from southern Mississippi to Oklahoma in 1831. On that forced march, 500 miles in the dead of winter, 14,000 Choctaw perished. In 1847, in the Oklahoma town of Skullville the Choctaw heard news of the famine that had been devastating Ireland. They raised $710, an immense sum for people themselves almost destitute, and sent it across a continent and an ocean.

My friend P. Sainath, India's best journalist, wrote a best-selling book in the mid-90s called Everybody Loves A Good Drought, which is very pertinent to the politics of disaster. Sainath began writing about the poorest people in India, and as he put it in his introduction, "the idea was to look at those conditions in terms of *processes*. Too often, poverty and deprivation get covered as *events*. That is, when some disaster strikes, when people die. " As I once put it myself, disasters are often normalcy, raised to the level of drama. The Exxon Valdez vents its oil off Alaska in the water, instead of taking it to Los Angeles to be discharged more discreetly into the air and thence into people's lungs.

After the tsunami I happened to be in correspondence with Sainath about an upcoming visit to India, and asked him for his reactions. His answer:

"On the politics of disaster? (Man-made disasters are more my line. I'm good at those.) Well, thinking about it, right now is the stage I call *Disaster Tourism*. Every twit in television wants to be seen hugging orphans. There are more cameras along the coastline than catamarans (those having been washed away in large numbers). This is the period when angry, intrepid reporters lambast uncaring governments for natural disasters that no one could have done much about. One reporter on the spot touched up her face to paint dark circles under her eyes — in fact, I did a piece called More Than A Million Hiroshimas which I'll attach [and which you can find on our CounterPunch site at www.counterpunch.org/sainath01062005.html] whose operative lines are : 'It is odd that we allow governments to get away with atrocities against the poor. But sternly hold them to blame for an unprecedented natural disaster.'

"Well, for whatever reason, the Delhi regime has done one sensible thing: It's asked the US to stick its aid and relief teams where it should. Remember our Gujarat earthquake of 2000? I must get you a report (social audit) done on the role of international relief agencies here. They came and set up air-conditioned tents for themselves, heaters and all, while quake victims froze in the cold, and collected gigantic sums of money they were not able to spend. The report shows that no one of these agencies (the real big guys) was able to spend even 30 per cent of what they'd collected, mostly much less. But in clogging all that money, they denied it to much smaller local organisations that would have been far more effective.

"About this disaster: Basically, we have spent most of the past 15 years making the coastline increasingly unsafe for the poor. Fishing villages have been squeezed into rougher and more dangerous terrain to make way for tourist resorts, five-star-on-the beach hotels, luxury resorts, you name it. To enable that, we've destroyed countless stretches of mangrove forests--and mangroves have always been nature's brake against tidal waves. Indeed, wherever large stretches of mangroves survived, the damage appears to have been much less. Also, another natural barrier, sand dunes, have been looted by the construction industry on a gigantic scale. For 15 years, we've cut the public health facilities available to the poor (standard neo-liberal textbook) and now, when we fear epidemics, there are none to fall back on. However, lots of dedicated medical personnel have gone in as volunteers and that's something.

"I saw a BBC anchor ask BBC's Daniel Lak: isn't the Indian government making a mistake in declining US aid? Lak was surprisingly sensible. He said I think they don't want too many people running over the disaster area, and there are lots of people working there already, or words to that effect.

"The real issues will come up weeks from now. When the government will do its best not to spend money or replacing permanent houses; when the schools that were destroyed have to be replaced with something decent. When thousands and thousands of boats, nets etc., (fishermen were obviously the worst affected) have to be rebuilt, replaced. That's when reporters will really be needed.

"Governments and agencies and elites love the relief mode. And did you know that travel agents fatten on each cyclone in Bangladesh? They immediately block lots of seats on all airlines to Dhaka — I kid you not — because they know the western media will come trooping in, in large numbers. They call their counterparts in Dhaka to check that the disaster is indeed a really big one – and block seats accordingly."

Droppings from Laughing Horse Books

When Bruce Anderson, editor of the great Anderson Valley Advertiser, moved from California to Oregon, Boonville's loss was Eugene's gain. I visited not so long after he and his wife Ling had settled in a nice house in the western end of town and took a photograph of the Mighty Editor with the dog Roscoe, standing in front of above-mentioned nice house. I couldn't take the photo now from that angle because a substantial cedar fence, eight foot high, shields the editorial lair from public view and at the practical level, prevents the dog Roscoe from perturbing neighbors who mistake this cultivated Proust-reading hound with a replaced hip for a potentially homicidal pit bull.

Bruce had AVA Oregon up and running within two months of arriving in town and I strongly urge all admirers of Bruce's journalism to subscribe. $22 for six months,$40 for one year send check made

Editors
Alexander Cockburn
Jeffrey St. Clair

Business
Becky Grant

Design
Deborah Thomas

Counselor
Ben Sonnenberg

Published twice monthly except August, 22 issues a year:
$40 individuals,
$100 institutions/supporters
$30 student/low-income
CounterPunch.
All rights reserved.
CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558
1-800-840-3683 (phone)
counterpunch@counterpunch.org
www.counterpunch.org

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out to AVA Oregon to PO box 40038, Eugene, OR 97404.

But Bruce and his paper have already alarmed the sensitive antennae of the prissy pwogs, meaning in this instance the people running Laughing Horse Books, an independent store in Portland I spoke at years ago and with which CounterPunch and my co-editor Jeffrey St Clair have had cordial relations. Signing itself the Laughing Horse collective, this outfit has written to Bruce in the following snotty terms: "Please cancel our account, none have sold, in addition serious charges have come to our attention…"

Yes, this is an independent store claiming to host "resources for radicals, activists, feminists, queers, heretics and visionaries". A big but empty claim, because it's clear that the minute someone in the collective squeaked that Bruce entertains heterodox notions about the Judi Bari case, or some other infraction of the PC code, the bookstore barred entry to an new, exciting Eugene-based paper.

They've got the joint covered. On the right, Nazis like Ashcroft or Gonzales; on the "left", the Laughing Horse collective. How many books are there on Laughing Horse shelves which haven't sold in months? Do they kick these books out after a couple of weeks? I'd say that Portland's book buyers should take their business elsewhere but that would be piling boycott on boycott. Just ask for AVA Oregon when you go in and demand a decent explanation.

It's not the first time I've run into this lust to censor among people supposedly dedicated to free speech and the enriching exchange of ideas. Three years ago I was browsing in Left Bank Books, the anarchist emporium in the Pike Place Market in Seattle right opposite the fish store where they throw salmon at each other in efforts to allure the tourists. I bought an armful of books. As I handed over my card for my purchases the nice fellow at the register saw my name, asked about CounterPunch and requested us to send along copies of the newsletter every two weeks.

Hardly had I made the necessary arrangements before my phone rang and a woman's voice haughtily informed me that Left Bank Books had no place for CounterPunch. Evidently, there had been a convulsion in the collective, with the usual outcome: when in doubt, Ban It. She was an Ashcroft in the making, clearly relishing the phone call from the bottom of her soul. I should add that we have other anarchist friends, in the form of the AK Collective in Oakland, with whom we publish CounterPunch Books.

It's Too Late to Ask Uday, But Can You Stuff Someone Through a Woodchipper?

Discussing an Iraqi faker touted by the Bush administration, I recently wrote that "In atrocity stories there are some things that don't ring true, even when dealing with such well-credentialed butchers as Saddam and his sons. Take the story, subsequently identified as one concocted by a Western intelligence agency, that Uday had put some of his victims through a wood chipper. Anyone using these chippers knows the damn things jam if inconvenienced by anything with a diameter larger than that of a stick of asparagus, let alone an Iraqi human, however scrawny. Uday's chipper, whose origin can probably be traced to a scene in the movie *Fargo*, just didn't pass muster, same as the incubator story from the first Gulf War, first identified in this column as intrinsically preposterous."

"Governments and agencies and elites love the relief mode. And did you know that travel agents fatten on each cyclone in Bangladesh?"

I was being slightly frivolous about the woodchipper, but the letters poured in.

Mr Cockburn, I imagine this will be but one of many, but what kind of piss ant wood chipper did you train on? I routinely use a medium sized chipper that will take up to 2" to 3" branches of green wood, and I don't think it would have much trouble with a person's arm, or even a leg. (And by the way, commercial wood chippers rarely jam.) Now whether you could get a whole human through one, I don't know, but I've heard of really sweet guys putting small animals through them just to watch the spray, so I suspect that if you did a bit of selective drawing and quartering you might eventually be able to do a whole body. But what mess. And what would be the point, even for something like Uday? You're right, the idea is farcical. But asparagus as an upper limit is off by several orders of magnitude.

Nicholas Dykema
Cleveland, Ohio

Dear Mr Cockburn,

Your fine web piece of Jan 8-9 contains a factual error that you might wish to be aware of. Although the residential-light commercial- tree service type of wood chipper might jam if fed a human body (they are designed to chew up brush and limbs), the type used in land clearing (the source of the woodchips we use for playground surfacing) and pulp-chip operations would not stutter if fed a regiment - one at a time of course. These chippers weigh about 30 tons, are diesel powered at about 1000 hp, and can digest a 24 inch diameter log - real fast. One of the major brands is www.morbark.com go to whole tree chippers This, of course, has no bearing on the truth or untruth of the story itself.

Regards
C Sommer
Dickerson, Md

Mr. Cockburn,

I agree with the primary drift of your piece that the story concerning Uday grinding up some of his victims is probably BS (as were a number of other atrocity stories about Saddam's regime) but have to take exception with your description of a wood chipper's "wimpyness". When I was on a CDF work crew in N. California in the early 1970's we had to "brush" roads and I used a chipper a number of times. I hated working around it because the damn things were so god awful noisy (even with ear protection) but I was surprised at how large a branch they would digest. The big chipper we used could chip a branch 3 inches in diameter anyway no problem. Handy but horrible machines and that's probably the reason it was used in those accounts.

Bob Ransdell
Soquel, CA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(**Spies** *continued from page 1)*

fund a pilot program known as the Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program (PRISP). Named after Senator Pat Roberts (R. Kansas, Chair, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence), PRISP was designed to train intelligence operatives and analysts in American university classrooms for careers in the CIA and other agencies. PRISP now operates on an undisclosed number of American college and university campuses, and if the pilot phase of the program proves to be a useful means of recruiting and training members of the intelligence community then the program will expand to more campuses across the country.

Currently, PRISP participants must be American citizens who are enrolled fulltime in graduate degree programs with a minimum GPA of 3.4. They need to, "complete at least one summer internship at CIA or other agencies", and they must pass the same background investigations as other CIA employees. PRISP students receive financial stipends ranging up to $25,000 per year and they are required to participate in closed meetings with other PRISP scholars and individuals from their administering intelligence agency.

Less than 150 students a year are now authorized to receive funding during the pilot phase as PRISP evaluates the program's initial outcomes. Beyond a few articles in a Kansas newspaper praising Senator Roberts, as well as University of Kansas anthropologist Felix Moos' role in lobbying for the PRISP, there has been a pervasive silence in the press about the program. The few guarded public statements describing PRISP stress supposed similarities between existing ROTC programs and the PRISP. For example, the *Lawrence Journal World* (11/29/03) published claims that "Those in the program would be part of the ROTC program specializing in learning how to analyze a variety of conditions and activities based on a thorough understanding and deep knowledge of particular areas of the world". Beyond the similar requirements that participants of both programs commit to years of service to their sponsoring military or intelligence branches there are few similarities between ROTC and PRISP. ROTC programs mostly operate in the open, as student-ROTC members register for ROTC courses and are proudly and visibly identified as members of the ROTC program, while PRISP students are instructed to keep their PRISP-affiliations hidden from others on campus.

PRISP is an open secret, and the CIA apparently prefers that it stay more secret than open. The CIA's website does not maintain an active link with detailed information on PRISP. Currently PRISP limits its advertising to intelligence recruiting websites (such as www.intelligencecareers.com or the National Ground Intelligence Center, http://monticello.avenue.org/ngic/index.shtml), and to small, controlled recruiting sessions. PRISP recruits scholars with, "advanced area expertise in China, Middle East, Korea, Central Asia, the Caucasus", with a special emphasis given to scholars with previous linguistic expertise in, "Chinese, Arabic, Persian, Urdu, Pashtun, Dari, Korean, or a Central Asian or Caucasian language such as Georgian, Turkmen, Tajik, or Uzbek". PRISP also funds Islamic studies scholars and scientists with expertise in bio-terrorism, counterterrorism, chemistry, physics, computer science and engineering.

The CIA man refused to identify which campuses are hosting these covert scholars.

My inquiries to Senator Roberts' staff concerning the current size and scope of PRISP yielded little useful information and Roberts' staff referred me to Mr. Tommy Glakas at the CIA. Glakas was reluctant to discuss many specific details of PRISP, but he did confirm that PRISP now funds about 100 students who are studying at an undisclosed number of American universities. When asked if PRISP was up and running on college campuses Glakas first answered that it was, then said it wasn't, then clarified that PRISP wasn't the sort of program that was tied to university campuses, being decentralized and tied to students. Pressed further on what this meant Glakas gave no further information. He said that he had no way of knowing exactly how many universities currently have students participating in PRISP, claiming he could not know this because PRISP is administered not just by the CIA, but also through a variety of individual intelligence agencies like the NSA, MID, or Naval Intelligence. He stressed that PRISP was a decentralized scholarship program which funds students through various intelligence agencies. Glakas said he didn't know who might know how many campuses had PRISP scholars. He refused to identify which campuses are hosting these covert PRISP scholars.

The Intelligence Scholars Program did not spring forth out of a vacuum. Like the Patriot Act, PRISP was conceived years ago, then waited for the right rendezvous of fear with opportunity to be born. PRISP is largely the brainchild of University of Kansas anthropologist Felix Moos, a longtime advocate of anthropological contacts with military and intelligence agencies. During the Vietnam War Moos worked in Laos and Thailand on World Bank-financed projects and over the years has worked in various military advisory positions. He worked on the Pentagon's ARPA Project Themis, and has been an instructor at the Naval War College and at the U.S. Staff and Command College at Fort Leavenworth. For years Moos has taught courses on "Violence and Terrorism" at the University of Kansas. In the months after the 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon Moos elicited the support of his friend, former CIA DCI, Stansfield Turner, to curry support in the senate and CIA to fund his vision of a merger between anthropology, academia, intelligence analysis and espionage training.

Professor Moos initially proposed that all PRISP students be required to master two foreign languages and use anthropology and history classes to learn the culture history of the regions they are studying. Moos's vision for PRISP was more comprehensive than the current pilot program and included classes on topics such as bio-terrorism and counterterrorism. Moos proposed having an active CIA campus presence where PRISP students would begin training as freshmen and, "by the time they would be commissioned, they would be ready to go to the branch intelligence units of their choice". If the pilot phase of PRISP goes well, this may be the direction in which this program develops, though it is doubtful that PRISP would expand in any way which openly identified participants.

It is tempting to describe Moos as an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anthropologist out of sync with his discipline's mainstream, but while many anthropologists express concerns about disciplinary ties to military and intelligence organizations, contemporary anthropology has no core with which to either align or diverge and there are others in the field who openly (and quietly) support such developments. Moos is a bright man, but his writings echo the antic tone and sentiments found in the limited bedside readings of Tom-Clancy-literate-colonials, as he prefers to quote from the wisdom of Sun Tzu and Samuel Huntington over anthropologists like Franz Boas or Laura Nader. Two years ago at an interesting and confrontational panel examining anthropological connections to intelligence agencies at the annual American Anthropological Association (AAA) meetings, I watched an angry Moos strike an action pose and rhetorically ask, "Have anthropologists learned so little since 9/11/2001, as to not recognize the truth and practicability, in Sun Tzu's reminder that: 'unless someone is subtle and perspicacious, he cannot perceive the substance in intelligence reports. It is subtle, subtle". From the dais I could see not so subtle anthropologists in the audience employed by Rand and the Pentagon nodding their heads as if his words had hit a secret chord. Moos was clearly onto something.

Felix Moos' notion of scholar-spies in part draws upon a highly romanticized history of anthropologists' contributions to the Allies' efforts in the Second World War. The pretensions of this imagined history have been increasingly undermined by FOIA and archival-based historical research into the complexities (both ethical and practical) of anthropologists plying their trade in even this "good" war. Back in 1995, before a commission modifying the AAA's code on anthropological ethics, Moos testified that anthropologists should be allowed to engage in secretive research, arguing that,

"In a world where weapons of mass destruction have become so terrible and terrorist actions so frightful, anthropologists must surrender naïve faith in a communitarian utopia and be prepared to encounter conflict and violence. Indeed they should feel the professional obligation to work in areas of ethnic conflict….But, as moral creatures so engaged, they would of course have to recognize the necessity of classifying some of their data, if for no other reason than to protect the lives of their subjects and themselves. "

This same devotion to secrecy is the root problem of the PRISP's presence on our campuses as well as with Moos' vision of anthropology harnessed for the needs of state. Moos' fallacy is his belief that the fundamental problem with American intelligence agencies is that they are lacking adequate cultural understanding of those they study, and spy upon. This fallacy is then exacerbated by the assumption that good intelligence operates best in realms of secrecy. America needs good intelligence, but the most useful and important intelligence can largely be gathered openly without the sort of covert invasion of our campuses that PRISP silently brings.

The fundamental problems with American intelligence are *exacerbated* by secrecy. When intelligence agencies are allowed to classify and hide their assumptions, reports and analyses from public view they generate self-referential narrow visions designed to buttress rather than challenge the policies of the administrations they serve. Intelligence agencies do need to understand the complex cultures they study, but to suggest that intelligence agencies like the CIA are simply amassing and interpreting political and cultural information is a dangerous fantasy: The CIA fulfills a tripartite role of gathering intelligence, interpreting intelligence, and working as a supraconstitutional covert arm of the presidency. It is this final role that should give scholars and citizens pause when considering how PRISP and other university-intelligence-linked programs will use the knowledge they take from our open classrooms.

The CIA makes sure we won't know which classrooms PRISP scholars attend, this being rationalized as a requirement for protecting the identities of intelligence personnel. But this secrecy shapes PRISP as it takes on the form of a covert operation in which PRISP students study chemistry, biology, sociology, psychology, anthropology and foreign languages without their fellow classmates, professors, advisors, department chairs or presumably even research subjects (creating serious ethics problems under any post-Nuremberg professional ethics code or Human Subject Review Board) knowing that they are working for the CIA, DIA, NSA or other intelligence agencies.

In a decade and a half of Freedom of Information Act research I have read too many FBI reports of students detailing the "deviant" political views of their professors. These range from the delightful (anthropologist Norman Humphrey was reported to have called President Eisenhower a "duckbilled nincompoop"); to the Dadaist (as when former Miss America, Marilyn van Derbur, reported that sociologist Howard Higman mocked J. Edgar Hoover in class); to the creepy (as when the FBI arranged for a graduate student to guide topics of 'informal' conversation with anthropologist Gene Weltfish that were later the focus of an inquiry by Joseph McCarthy). These PRISP students are likely also secretly compiling dossiers on their professors and fellow students.

Of course I would be remiss to not mention that students are not the only ones sneaking the CIA onto our campuses. There are also unknown thousands of university professors who periodically work with and for the CIA. In 1988 CIA spokeswoman Sharon Foster bragged that the CIA then secretly employed enough university professors "to staff a large university". Most experts estimate that this presence has grown since 2001.

Given the steady cuts in federal funding for higher education, and the resulting pressures for more mercenary roles for the academy, the quiet rise of programs like PRISP should surprise no one. Since

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/Renew Subscription here:

One year $40 Two yrs $70
($35 email only / $45 email/print)
One year institution/supporters $100
One year student/low income, $30
T-shirts, $17
Please send back issue(s)
_____ ($5/issue)

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

_____

Payment must accompany order, or dial 1-800-840-3683 and renew by credit card. Add $12.50 for Canadian and $17.50 for foreign subscriptions. If you want Counter-Punch emailed to you please supply your email address. Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch**
Business Office
PO Box 228, Petrolia, CA 95558

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1945, scholars naively self-recruited themselves or followed classmates to the CIA, but increasingly those of us who have studied the languages, culture and histories of peoples around the world have also learned about the role of the CIA in undermining the autonomy of those cultures we study, and the steady advance of this history has hurt the agency's efforts to recruit the best and brightest of post-graduates. For decades the students studying Arabic, Urdu, Basque or Farsi were predominantly curious admirers of the cultures and languages in which they immersed themselves, but the current shift now sees a significant increase in students driven by the market forces of Bush's War on Terrorism. If the CIA can use PRISP to indenture students in the early days of their graduate training, itself supplemented with mandated summer camp internships immersed in the workplace ethos of CIA, the company can mold their ideological inclinations even before their grasp of cultural history is shaped in the relatively open environment of their university. As these PRISP graduates enter the CIA's institutional environment of self-reinforcing Group Think the likelihood of them entertaining or advancing heterodox views will already have been significantly diminished. Institutional Group Think can thus safely be protected from external infection.

But while PRISP protects and intensifies the supremacy of inbred thinking at CIA and elsewhere, it threatens the academic integrity of anthropology and other academic disciplines that unwittingly become complicit partners with these intelligence agencies. The CIA has long recognized that anthropology, with its broadly traveled and culturally and linguistically competent practitioners has very useful skill sets, even though we should not read too much into published reports that the CIA-directed torture techniques at Abu Ghraib were fine-tuned for high levels of culturally specific humiliation by the reading of anthropologist Raphael Patai's book *The Arab Mind*.

In 15 years of FOIA research I have read too many FBI reports of students detailing the "deviant" political views of their professors.

Patai's scholarship is stained with Orientalist stereotypes and it doesn't take an insider's knowledge that Arabs generally abhor dogs and sexual humiliation to conclude that tormenting bound naked men with vicious dogs would be an effective means of torture.

Anthropologists have long had their work pilfered by American intelligence agencies. To cite but two documented examples, in 1951, the CIA cut a covert deal with the AAA's executive board, where the latter provided the CIA access to data on anthropologists' cultural and linguistic specialties as the CIA secretly produced the first cross-indexed roster of AAA members for the AAA on the CIA's computers. In 1962 the U.S. Department of Commerce illegally translated Georges Condominas' ethnography, *We Have Eaten the Forest* on highland Vietnamese Montagnards for use as a counterinsurgency tool. Though no scholar can control the uses of information they make public, there does need to be an awareness of how any knowledge can be abused by others. And as awareness of the presence of PRISP spreads, many scholars may find themselves engaging in new forms of self-censorship and doublethink.

Healthy academic environments need openness because they, unlike the CIA, are nourished by the virtues of open disagreement, dissent, and reformulation. The presence of the PRISP's secret sharers brings hidden agendas that sabotage these fundamental academic processes.

The Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program infects all academia with the viruses of dishonesty and distrust as participant scholars cloak their intentions and their ties to the cloaked masters they serve. CP

David H. Price is the author of *Threatening Anthropology: McCarthyism and the FBI's Surveillance of Activist Anthropologists,* (Duke University Press, 2004). He can be reached at dprice@stmartin.edu

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558

For *New* Long-Sleeved T-Shirts
Call 1-800-840-3683

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED